

Appln. Serial No. 09/613,323  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on January 12, 2006

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 22 and 28 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 22 and 28 are sought to be amended. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 , second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said accessed information”. Applicant has amended this limitation in claims 1, 6 and 11 to recite “said received information”. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 to claims 1, 6 and 11 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2001/0003828 A1 (hereinafter referred to as “Peterson”) in

Appln. Serial No. 09/613,323  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on January 12, 2006

further view of US Patent No. 6,389,593 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Yamagishi").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 1-15 since Peterson and Yamagishi, either taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 6 and 11 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to include a similar feature of wherein said content and said index table are added at the plurality of receivers to one or more previously multicast content and index tables. Peterson and Yamagishi, either taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 6 and 11 (and their dependent claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15) are patentable over Peterson and Yamagishi, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 1-15 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2003/0206554 A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Dillon") in further view of Yamagishi. The Examiner gives Official Notice that it is well known in the art to parse/separately store indexing information for the purpose of providing a comprehensive index such as EPG program information received with broadcasted programming for the purpose of facilitating the selection of content and alleviate the receiver processor load of creating an index. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 16-30 since Dillon, Yamagishi and the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims

**Appln. Serial No. 09/613,323**  
**Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on January 12, 2006**

16, 22 and 28 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 16, 22 and 28 have been amended to include a similar feature of wherein said content and said index table are added to one or more previously received content and index tables. Dillon, Yamagishi and the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 16, 22 and 28 (and their dependent claims 17-21, 23-27, 29 and 30) are patentable over Dillon, Yamagishi and the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 16-30 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Intel Corporation

Dated: April 12, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P8981 RCE Reply to Non-Final OA

---

**RAM Fee History Query**  
Revenue Accounting and Management

---

Name/Number: 09613323

Total Records Found: 5

Start Date: Any Date

End Date: Any Date

Accounting Date	Sequence Num.	Fee Type	Fee Code	Fee Amount	Mailroom Date	Payment Method
10/27/2005	00000002	1	<u>1801</u>	\$790.00	10/20/2005	DA 022666
08/04/2000	00000172	1	<u>581</u>	\$40.00	07/11/2000	CK
07/20/2000	00000090	1	<u>101</u>	\$690.00	07/11/2000	CK
07/20/2000	00000091	1	<u>102</u>	\$468.00	07/11/2000	CK
07/20/2000	00000092	1	<u>103</u>	\$270.00	07/11/2000	CK

---